

veterans of this country are becoming aware of what is being done to them, and I urge this Congress to take action to reverse these policies.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 13, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2003**

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-3) on the resolution (H. Res. 29) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 13) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REMEMBERING WILLIE JAMES "BUDDY" CHISHOLM**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in sadness to share the passing of a good friend and a model parent, Mr. Willie James Chisholm. He was better known to me and his other friends and family as "Buddy."

His passing will be strongly felt by all of us because he was such a dedicated and caring person. One of the many things I admired about him was his joy in being a father. He made it a priority in his life to spend quality time with his two children, William and Cheryl.

The time spent with children is priceless and something that is hard to do for most parents, given how busy our lives have become. But Buddy knew how important it was and made sure to be a strong role model for his children, grandchildren, and other young people he knew in his community.

Indeed, Buddy exhibited traits that are fast becoming relics of the past: a dedicated and fulfilling faith, commitment to his 27-year career at McDonnell Douglas as a brick mason, and a love for the outdoors, sports, and traveling.

The world is a better place with people like Buddy Chisholm in it. His presence will certainly be missed. His memory will live on spiritually in the lives of those he touched, as well as physically in the many brick-laying projects he was involved with that beautified the Los Angeles area.

I send my heartfelt condolences to the Chisholm family. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

**ECONOMY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President has the wrong plan on the economy. We need to focus on job creation and not on elimination of the tax on dividends. The President's plan only helps the wealthy and not middle-class and low-income Americans.

Fifty-five percent of Americans believe that President Bush is not paying enough attention to the economy. The economy has lost 1.7 million jobs over the last two years and there are now 8.6 million Americans out of work. The plan unveiled by the President is simply more huge tax breaks for the few that will not stimulate growth and create jobs.

As millions of people are out of work and the economy continues in a weak and jobless recovery, we must have a strong and immediate economic program that gives workers and families money immediately.

The centerpiece of the President's plan—the complete elimination of all taxes on stock dividends—will primarily benefit the wealthy rather than putting money into the hands of working class families.

The Congressional Budget Office concluded last year that "tax cuts that are targeted toward lower-income households are likely to generate more stimulus dollar for dollar of revenue loss—that is, be more cost-effective and have more bang for the buck—than those concentrated among higher-income households."

Ending the dividends tax will not provide the economy with a short-term stimulus. The Bush plan calls for a 10-year, \$600 billion tax cut package. The President's plan simply favors the wealthy. The Democrats have offered a \$136 billion plan for families and businesses and tax cuts that would take effect this year.

Projections indicate that the President's plan would boost budget deficits even higher. A study by the Urban Institute and the Brookings Institution show that a typical taxpayer with taxable annual income of \$30,000 to \$40,000 would receive a tax cut of \$42 in 2003. For a family, this does not amount to much. However, those with taxable incomes of more than \$1 million would receive on average \$27,097.

The Democratic plan provides \$55 billion in tax relief for working families, including a one-time rebate of \$300 for individuals and \$600 for married couples. It also includes \$32 billion in business tax cuts; small businesses could write off up to \$50,000 in investments; and cash-strapped state governments would be provided with \$31 billion which could be used for homeland security, roads and bridges, Medicaid and aid to the unemployed.

Unemployment is at its highest levels in a decade. Nearly 6 percent of Americans are unemployed and daily we hear about corporations laying off tens of thousands of employees. Our trade deficit stands at 14 percent.

The President's economic stimulus package and a war against Iraq would push the federal budget deficit into record levels—as high as \$350 billion.

Tax cuts cost and we are already operating under deficits—and the President has not clearly outlined who will pay for these tax cuts to the wealthy.

**IRAQ**

I am pleased that the United States, in seeking United Nations support for a new Security Council Resolution regarding Iraq, chose the path of multilateralism in dealing with Iraq and the potential threat of any weapons of mass destruction that it may possess.

Through strong diplomacy, we have placed weapons inspectors back on the ground, armed with greater investigative power and new technology that enables them to be more effective at their difficult task.

To date, it appears that Iraqi officials are granting access to all sites visited including presidential palaces and other sensitive locations. Now that we have re-established a system that contains all of the components that we deemed necessary in the latest resolution, it is important that we give this program a change to succeed.

The policy of the government appears confused at this point—still determined to effect regime change even as we profess to be choosing the path of peace. This is troubling because the Congress still retains the obligation to declare war should it become necessary, and the UN Security Council has been vested with the authority to evaluate the level of Iraqi cooperation prior to authorizing the use of force.

All preparations seem to be for war, and not for peace. The military buildup in the region does not appear to be countered by an equally aggressive diplomatic agenda to solve the crisis.

When our military openly speaks of planning for a war to begin in mid to late February, our foreign policy appears to be directed solely by the weather conditions in Iraq instead of serious consideration of what war will do to the region as well as to the economic and military security of our own country.

This is tantamount to holding a finger up to the wind to decide which route to take. The lives of our brave members of the armed forces are far too precious to risk based on planning that makes the weather the primary consideration on whether or not to wage war.

And now in recent weeks there has been an increasingly tense war of words between the North Korean Defense Ministry and U.S. government officials.

By all accounts, North Korea poses a more immediate threat to its neighbors and the United States than does Iraq. North Korea undisputedly has a deadly nuclear arsenal and has unabashedly pledged to reactive its nuclear weapons program.

When confronted recently with the possibility of sanctions to force its compliance with its previous non-proliferation agreement, North Korea responded by stating that sanctions are war, and that in war it would be merciless.

Today's threats are not the same as they were only months ago. Today's new threats pose new challenges to our Nation—challenges that our Congress is duty-bound to meet.

Congress is obligated to examine the new challenges that face our country and the world and to make crucial decisions based upon all of the information available. Making a truly informed decision with respect to the threats we may face today demands that we reconsider the decision we made months ago when our world was a different place.

On January 7, 2003 I introduced legislation that would repeal the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution that was signed into law last October. Public Law 107-243 was enacted into law on October 16, 2002 prior to the deployment of United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq, and at a time when the current nuclear crisis in North Korea had not reached its present level of dangerous tension.

This legislation, H. Con. Res. 2, seeks to repeal Public Law 107-243 in order to ensure that Congress is afforded the opportunity to reexamine the threat posed by Iraq, which would include taking the time to review fully and accurately the findings of the international weapons inspectors prior to the engagement of military forces.

Passage of H. Con. Res. 2 would also provide Congress the time to consider any exit strategy that must be developed prior to deploying troops, as well as the serious domestic impact that possible war with Iraq would involve.

The domestic considerations include the impact on our already struggling economy and the high numbers of troops needed over an indefinite period of time. Such concerns raise the issue of our security at the most basic level when, for example, some municipalities are already losing nearly 10% of their police forces due to officers who have been activated with the reserves of the armed forces.

Iraq has allowed international weapons inspectors to re-enter the country in order to identify and destroy weapons of mass destruction and development capabilities. Weapons inspectors have also begun to interview Iraqi scientists who have been key to the development of the privy to the country's military.

Taking the time to deliberate more intelligently in no way diminishes the valor of our troops. To the contrary, because we love and support our young men and women who are willing to give their lives to defend their nation, they deserve our fullest efforts to keep them out of harm's way.

When President Bush addressed the UN last Fall, he warned that it risks irrelevancy if it did not stand up and take decisive action with regard to Iraq. Now that it has, we risk rendering it irrelevant when we appear ready to act on our own conclusions—conclusions that have yet to be supported by substantive evidence.

If the Administration has credible evidence of illegal weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, it should immediately share this information with the weapons inspectors so it can be substantiated once and for all. And here at home, the Administration should own up and tell the truth to the American people regarding the level of threat we are actually facing.

#### IRAQ HAS NOT DISARMED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, 6,500 chemical bombs, which is roughly 1,000 tons of deadly chemical; 2,000 chemical rockets, 8,500 liters of biological agent or medium, and that is enough to produce some 5,000 liters of anthrax; these weapons are the weapons which Chief Weapons Inspector of the United Nations Hans Blix says the Iraqi Government has failed to produce for the inspecting teams. In other words, Iraq has not disarmed.

Now, we have heard in the last several months lots of statements from the administration, and we have heard statements from proponents of the

President's policy and from opponents of the President's policy. But these are the statements from the United Nations weapons inspector whose job was to go to Iraq, confront the Iraqi Government with their own statements, their own declarations and documents, some of which we had captured, others which they had produced during the 1990s, list the items line by line saying, here are weapons that you listed; where are they? And, in fact, Iraq has now failed to produce those weapons, meaning Iraq has failed to disarm.

This is an exercise in disarmament. That is where the country which is being inspected is supposed to make a declaration as to what weapons they have, just like South Africa did with its nuclear program, and then offer up the locations of those stockpiled weapons and that machinery that produces the weapons for destruction by this international body. In fact, Iraq has done what we predicted it would do, and that is that it has hidden these weapons, which it heretofore had proclaimed it had. We know they have them, we know they have them buried somewhere, and they are failing to produce them. That is, they are failing to disarm, and those are the words of the Chief Weapons Inspector.

Madam Speaker, let me just go to a couple of particulars once more. I am quoting Chief Weapons Inspector Hans Blix. He says, "The document indicates," and he received the document from the Iraqi Air Force as to how many bombs they had had at one time, chemical bombs, because we know they use chemical bombs on their own people and on their neighbors, and he said, "The document indicated that some 13,000 chemical bombs were dropped by the Iraqi Air Force between 1983 and 1998, while Iraq has declared that 19,500 bombs were consumed during this period. Thus, there is a discrepancy of some 6,500 bombs. The amount of chemical agent in these bombs would be in the order of about 1,000 tons. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we must assume that these quantities are now unaccounted for."

So, Madam Speaker, we know what they had, we know what they have. Incidentally, Chief Inspector Hans Blix goes through each one of these circumstances where they have failed to come forward and produce the weapons or show evidence that they were destroyed. And in these cases that I have cited, there is no evidence that they have destroyed any of this stuff. We know it is still there, and we know it is there in most cases not by evidence that we received through a third party, but by the statements of Iraq itself at a previous time.

In turning to biological weapons, Mr. Blix said, and I quote, "I mentioned the issue of anthrax to the Council on previous occasions, and I come back to it as an important one. Iraq has declared that it produced 8,500 liters of this biological warfare agent which it states it unilaterally destroyed in the

summer of 1991." So Iraq claimed that they had gotten rid of this in secret, and he says, "I find no convincing evidence for its destruction."

He goes on. He says, "As I reported to the Council on the 19th of December last year, Iraq did not declare a significant quantity, some 650 kilos, of bacterial growth media which was acknowledged as reported in Iraq's submission to the panel in February 1999. As a part of its 7 December, 2002, declaration, Iraq resubmitted the Amorim Panel document, but the table showing this particular import of media," and this is the media from which you grow anthrax, extremely deadly anthrax, he said, "The table showing this report was not included. The absence of this table would appear to be deliberate, as the pages of the resubmitted document were renumbered." Meaning that Iraq pulled out this 650 kilos of anthrax media, simply tore that page out of the report, renumbered the report, and handed it to the weapons inspectors. That 650 kilos, incidentally, is enough growth media to produce about 5,000 liters of anthrax.

So we know now that Saddam Hussein has maintained and kept both biological weapons and chemical weapons, and he has failed to turn them over. He has failed to disarm.

Does he have a method to deliver these weapons? Yes, he does. They include the AS-2 and the AF-2 missiles, which are illegal missiles, because these missiles have been tested for ranges beyond 150 kilometers that Saddam Hussein is limited to.

□ 1930

He has also refurbished his missile infrastructure, that means his capability to develop and build missiles to carry these chemical and biological weapons to their targets. He has also acquired, very recently, some 300 rocket engines.

So the point is, Mr. Speaker, that when the smoke all clears, at least with respect to the work that has been done so far, I think what has happened is pretty predictable, because we on the Committee on Armed Services in the House had in open session an Iraqi engineer who appeared before us who was part of Saddam Hussein's weapons development program. He said to us that even in the 1990s when we had inspectors on the ground and those inspectors were being shown the insides of big empty buildings, a few miles away Saddam Hussein's program was going at full steam and the inspectors did not know anything about it.

So take this country, which is twice the size of the State of Idaho, and take this small contingent, roughly the size of a police force in a small American city, and spread them out over a piece of land twice the size of Idaho. And having given the other guys literally years to hide their weapons, it is no surprise that no weapons are found. In fact, if some of our inspectors walked into the middle of one of these big